

REMARKS

Claims 1-16 are pending in this application. All of the pending claims are rejected.

Claims 1, 6, 7, 9, 10, and 16 are currently amended. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 9 were subject to objection for informalities in dependency. The dependencies have been changed accordingly.

Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by US 7,233,987 (Watkinson). Claims 1, 6 and 16 have been amended to recite delaying forwarding a PIM prune message in response to an IGMP Leave if the Designated Router is in the upstream path from the IGMP host. Support for this feature is in the Specification at page 12, lines 8 through 18. Note that if the designated router is upstream from the IGMP host a potential problem occurs because there may be other members of the multicast group on the local network. The recited limitation helps avoid this problem because the presence of such other members can be indicated by a Join received during the delay. Claim 10 has been amended to recite not processing a PIM prune message if a local IGMP host exists. Support for this feature is in the Specification at page 13, lines 11 through 18. Further examination in view of the claim amendments is requested.

Claims 4, 8 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watkinson in view of US 6,331,983 (Haggerty). Each of these dependent claims further define the invention, and are allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims. With regard to the claim 8, which recites “delaying removal of the member from the group at the designated router for a predetermined time period,” the Examiner cites Haggerty at column 19, lines 35-45. The cited passage states that “delaying **queries** on those access ports having active senders would reduce the problem but not solve it.” (emphasis added) The quoted statement is

irrelevant to the presently claimed invention because (1) it has nothing to do with delaying removal of a member (nor delaying forwarding of a PIM prune message); and (2) it specifically states that delaying does not solve the problem, i.e., it teaches away.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Applicants' Attorney at the number listed below so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

January 17, 2008
Date

/Holmes W. Anderson/
Holmes W. Anderson, Reg. No. 37,272
Attorney/Agent for Applicant(s)
McGuinness & Manaras LLP
125 Nagog Park
Acton, MA 01720
(978) 264-6664

Docket No. 120-334
Dd: 1/17/2008